

CURRENT COMMENT.

THE KNAPPE, the German Consul at St. Louis, has been placed upon the retired list.

The lower House of the Iowa Legislature has passed the Australian Ballot Reform bill.

EX-THESAUER MARTIN A. JAMERSON, of Warren County, O., has been acquitted of the charge of embezzlement.

STRIKING workmen were turbulent at Vienna recently. They pillaged the Jews and set fire to a wine shop.

The non-Socialist unions of Germany, numbering 63,000 persons, have refused to observe May 1 as a labor holiday.

HER GRUKENVALD, Rome correspondent of the Frankfort Zeitung, has been expelled from Italy for attacking the triple alliance.

The Canadian Parliament has raised the penalty for polygamy from two to five years. This is aimed at the Mormons settling in Manitoba.

The House Committee on Cologne, Weights and Measures has ordered a favorable report on a bill for the recognition of the metric system.

HARON FERNANDEZ ROTHSCHILD's mansion at his country seat at Yalesburg, England, has been partly burned. Among the property destroyed was a picture by Gainsborough valued at \$80,000.

A commission of officials of the ministries of public instruction and police have made an inquiry into the recent riots among the students at the St. Petersburg Technological Institute. As a result of their investigation twenty-eight students will be expelled from St. Petersburg. The other students who were arrested for taking part in the demonstrations have been released.

MR. GLADSTONE, addressing a number of deputations at the railroad station at Tring recently, said the Government's Irish Land Purchase bill was in a fishy condition, judging from the manner of its reception even by the friends of the Government. It would be awkward, he said, if a case of the loan had been made the debtors should repudiate on the ground that they were forced to borrow.

RUSSIAN authorities acted with considerable severity in punishing the disorderly students. Fifty-five at the Agricultural Academy at Moscow were sent home and three expelled from the Technological Institute; thirteen sent home and two expelled from the School of Forestry, and fifteen sent home and two expelled from the Veterinary School at Charkoff.

SENATOR CULLOM has reported favorably from the Committee on Interstate Commerce the bill to amend section 12 of the Interstate Commerce act. The amendments provide that the Commission may require the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents from any place in the United States at any place of hearing fixed by the Commission; also that the testimony may be taken by deposition upon motion by any party to the case or by order of the Commission.

The Northern Society of Georgia has adopted a constitution. The objects are described as social and political among Northern men resident in the South, the dissemination of reliable information, the discouragement or correction of inconsiderate action or speech tending to estrange any portions of our country, and the development of the resources of the South. Discussion of politics or religion at any of its meetings is punishable by expulsion.

On the other day at Galena, Ill., a mother and daughter stood at the altar together and both took upon themselves the vows of wedlock, the grandmother of the bride being present as bridesmaid. The parties, male and female, to the unique affair were: William E. Hammond, of Dubuque, and Mary E. Reddington, of St. Joseph, Mo.; and John E. Reddington, of St. Joseph, Mo., and Miss E. J. Reddington. The first named lady was on the shady side of fifty and her daughter was a comely maiden of twenty.

Each delegate to the Pan-American conference was the recipient of a beautiful silk American flag, the gift of the American Silk Culture Association of the United States. Mrs. John L. Latta, of Philadelphia, made a short presentation address, in which she explained that the silk of which the flags were made was grown and manufactured in America. The flags were presented as a token of friendship from the people of the United States to her sister republics.

The House Committee on the Judiciary has completed consideration of the Hays bankruptcy bill. It has reported favorably and ordered it to be reported favorably. A number of amendments have been made, but they are simply corrections and changes of phraseology and do not affect the principles of the bill. Mr. Culberson, of Texas, will submit a minority report and urge the substitution of his own bill, which is a short measure, providing for the discharge within six months after bankruptcy of any bankrupt who has in good faith assigned to a trustee all of his property not exempt under local law.

SECRETARY PROCTOR has issued an order directing that a record be furnished and kept in the War Department of service efficiency and special qualifications of officers of the army. The record will be of the army before the rank of Colonel, including the condition of their commands and percentage of desertions therefrom. This record in the way of army reform is based on the custom of the German army chiefs of keeping a constant record of the special attainments and qualifications of each officer. It is designed to fill a want that has of late years been seriously felt in the army whenever it has been necessary to send an officer on some special service for which peculiar qualifications are required.

COLONEL JOHN ARMAN, of Chicago, died recently at San Diego, Cal., of nervous prostration. He was seventy years old, a native of Pittsburgh, N. Y., and in former years was the brilliant commander of the criminal bar of Cook County, Ill.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Cleaned By Telegraph and Mail.

CONGRESS.

IN THE SENATE the 4th Mr. Morrill (Kan.) reported back the House bill to admit free of duty articles intended for the St. Louis Exposition 1892 that might be imported from Mexico. The bill was amended to read "other American Republics and the Dominion of Canada," and the bill passed. After disposing of resolutions the Montana case was taken up and further debate had until after the adjournment. The Senate passed the bill to amend the act relating to the Montana case, and a bill making an appropriation to cover the bill of Montana case was passed.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE SENATE the 4th passed the House bill appropriating \$750,000 to reimburse members for the St. Louis Exposition, and then resumed the Montana case. After several speeches the matter went over. The Chicago case was taken up and after some talk on the subject, went over without action and the Senate adjourned.

THE PAN-AMERICANS.

Full Text of the Report of the Committee on General Welfare—Arbitration Recommended as a Principle of American International Law for the Settlement of Differences—How it Should be Enforced—Other Nations May Become Party to the Agreement.

WASHINGTON, April 12.—The Pan-American Conference held under consideration the report of the Committee on General Welfare. The full text of the report is as follows:

ARTICLE I. The Republics of Central and South America and Haiti, hereby adopt arbitration as a principle of American international law for the settlement of all differences, disputes or controversies between two or more of them.

ART. 2. Arbitration shall be obligatory in cases of disputes, disputes or controversies between two or more of them.

ART. 3. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 4. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 5. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 6. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 7. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 8. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 9. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 10. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 11. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 12. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 13. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 14. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 15. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 16. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 17. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 18. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 19. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 20. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 21. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 22. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 23. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 24. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 25. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 26. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 27. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 28. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 29. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 30. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 31. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 32. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 33. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 34. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 35. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 36. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 37. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 38. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 39. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 40. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 41. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 42. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 43. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 44. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 45. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 46. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

ART. 47. Any controversy or difference, whether of a political, territorial, or other nature, shall be referred to arbitration, whether pending or hereafter arising, shall be submitted to arbitration, even though the parties may have agreed to the contrary.

ART. 48. No questions shall be referred to arbitration which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature, and which are not of a political, territorial, or other nature.

KANSAS SCHOOL LAW.

No Separate Schools Allowable For Whites and Blacks—The Olathe Case Decided By Judge Burris.

OLATHE, Kan., April 12.—The long talked of case, in which the public schools, which have been in the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was settled by Judge Burris, who decided that under the laws of the State of Kansas, no separate schools for whites and blacks are allowable.

The case was brought on by the board of education of the city of Olathe, who had kept a constant watch over the district court here since last October, was